MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., SEPTEMBER 29, 1938

The third meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday, September 29, 1938. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETINGS: The Minutes of the Meetings held July 28, and August 10, 1938, were approved.

2. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FLAG: By Act approved June 16, 1938 (Public No. 650, 75th Congress), the following legislation was adopted:

> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, created a commission to procure a design for a distinctive flag for the District of Columbia, the seat of the Capital of the Nation: Provided: That in the selection of such design the commission hereby created shall have the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.
>
> Approved, June 16, 1938.

Pursuant thereto the District of Columbia Flag Commission, through its Chairman, Hon. M. C. Hazen, submitted two designs with letter of August 24, 1938, as follows:

> Gentlemen:
>
> In accordance with the Act of Congress approved June 16th, 1938, authorizing the procurement of a distinctive design for a flag for the District of Columbia, there are transmitted, herewith, two (2) proposed designs for this flag.
>
> The first design is based on the shield portion of the coat of arms of the Washington family. The proportions of this design are related

to the hoist. The chief is 3/10, the horizontal red bars 2/10, the base and white space between the bars 2/10 and 1/10 respectively. The red stars are 2/10 in diameter, and are spaced equidistant in the fly. The length of the fly will depend on the proportions of the flag or flags with which this design may be displayed. There is also enclosed a history of the derivation of the Washington coat of arms on which this design is based, and a sample of the flag.

The second design is one submitted by Mrs. George T. Hawkins, 1616--16th St., N. W., a member of the American Liberty Chapter of the D. A. R. A clipping from the Washington Post of May 14, 1938 describing the design of the flag is enclosed together with a statement handed to the Flag Commission by Mrs. Hawkins suggesting the substitution of the shield portion of the coat of arms of the Washington family for the Capitol dome shown in the center of the design and the omission of the lettering if desired.

Your early advice will be appreciated together with the return of the designs and documents submitted with this letter.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Melvin C. Hazen,
President,
Board of Commissioners, D. C.,
(Chairman, D. C. Flag Commission)

These two designs received the preliminary attention of Mr. Shepley, Acting Chairman, in the absence of Mr. Clarke in Europe. Mr. Shepley thought it desirable to have the District of Columbia Flag Commission submit all of their designs to the Commission of Fine Arts. Accordingly Mr. Hazen sent approximately 15 additional designs with letter of September 7, 1938, as follows:

Dear Sir:

Reply is made to your letter of August 31, 1938, acknowledging the receipt of the two designs for the proposed District of Columbia flag transmitted with my letter of August 24, 1938, and stating that the members of the Commission would be interested in seeing all designs that have been submitted to the District of Columbia Flag Commission.

In compliance with your request all of the designs submitted up to the present time are forwarded herewith, together with a list of the names and addresses of the persons who have submitted such designs.

There is also transmitted a copy of a letter addressed to me under date of August 31, 1938, by Captain A. D. Hopping, Office of the Quartermaster General of the War Department, a member of the Flag Commission, together with enclosures forwarded with Captain Hopping's letter as follows:

File of the photostatic copies of newspaper clippings showing designs submitted in previous contests.

The original drawing of a flag design submitted by Major and Mrs. Ward in the 1924 contest.

Your early advice will be appreciated together with the return of the designs and documents submitted with this letter.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) M. C. Hazen,
President,
Board of Commissioners, D. C.
(Chairman, D. C. Flag Commission)

Also the District of Columbia Flag Commission submitted several additional designs, all of which were brought to the attention of the Commission by the secretary, who had prepared a list of the names and addresses of the 25 competitors. (Exhibit A)

Of the two designs submitted by the Flag Commission (marked A and B), Mr. Savage and Mr. Lamb inspected in particular during the morning session Design A, which represented an adaptation of the Coat of Arms of George Washington. Mr. Savage and Mr. Lamb made sketches showing possible changes in this design. Mr. Savage inspected all the designs during the afternoon and formulated the following statement:

> The Commission of Fine Arts advise that of the various designs considered by your organization and submitted to it for comment, the design marked "A" consisting of two red bars and three red stars and the similar design by Mr. and Mrs. Moultrie Ward are far the most appropriate. We leave open the question of the exact variation of those designs that might ultimately be decided upon.
>
> For their own information members of this Commission prepared several phases of the designs mentioned and they are herewith inclosed.

The Commission gave further attention to the designs late in the afternoon, and after discussion decided that before taking any action in the matter to ask

for a conference with the District of Columbia Flag Commission at the next meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on Saturday, October 15th. This was arranged accordingly. (Exhibit A-1)

3. MUNICIPAL CENTER: Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth, Municipal Architect, submitted a model (32 feet to the inch) showing the Municipal Center building located on the east and west sides of John Marshall Place, leaving an unobstructed vista on John Marshall Place from Pennsylvania Avenue to the old Hadfield Court House, in accordance with the urgent recommendation of the Commission. Mr. Wyeth reported that the appropriation by Congress has been supplemented by a P. W. A. allotment, and the District Commissioners now have $5,700,000 for the two buildings. Mr. Wyeth stated that there will be the same amount of office space in this scheme as there was in the old scheme of one building directly across John Marshall Place; under it will be parking space and mechanical equipment for air conditioning. The Commission approved the model. It was also approved at the joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission during the afternoon, at which it was decided to have the landscape architect members of both commissions confer with Mr. Wyeth with reference to an appropriate landscape plan for John Marshall Place.

The Commission approved the model and congratulated Mr. Wyeth on the eminently satisfactory result. A report was sent to Commissioner Hazen. (Exhibit B)

4. NEW DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA JAIL: Mr. Wyeth presented a design for an enlarged District of Columbia Jail. Mr. A. H. Wilson of the firm of Pierson and Wilson, consulting architects, of Washington, explained the design. He pointed out that the new buildings are designed to be in harmony with the existing old jail, which is a large red sandstone building, Richardsonian in its style of architecture. The cornice in the old building is 5 feet wide; this has been reduced in the new buildings. Mr. Lamb thought the design well executed, in

which opinion Mr. Borie concurred, and upon their recommendation the Commission approved it. (Exhibit C)

As to the brick to be used, Mr. Wilson said it is proposed to use a deep red brick to harmonize with the old building.

5. NEW DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MORGUE: Mr. Wyeth presented a design for a new District of Columbia Morgue to be located back from the street adjacent to the Congressional Cemetery and near Gallinger Hospital in Southeast Washington. The building was designed by Waldron Faulkner, architect. It will measure 87 feet by 50 feet and will be 40 feet high. The Commission approved the design but suggested to Mr. Wyeth some further study be given to the entrance doorway.

6. THOMAS JEFFERSON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Wyeth submitted a design for the new Thomas Jefferson Junior High School, to be located in the squares between G and I, 7th and 9th Streets, S. W., not far from the Washington Channel. A recreational area is planned in connection with the school. The building was designed in the colonial style of architecture which prevailed in Washington during the early days of the Republic (Early Federal). The Commission approved the design. (Exhibit C)

7. MARCONI MEMORIAL: The secretary reported that yesterday, September 28, he accompanied a committee representing the Marconi Memorial Foundation, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City, on an inspection trip to select a location for the proposed memorial. The committee consisted of Judge John J. Freschi, Count Luigi Crissuolo, S. Samuel Di Falco (Secretary), Fortune Pope (son of Generoso Pope, President of the Foundation) and Attilio Piccirilli, sculptor.

Judge Freschi, Count Crissuolo and Mr. Piccirilli were present to confer with the Commission. Judge Freschi advised that Mr. Generoso Pope had just raised $800,000 to help the Red Cross in Ethiopia and therefore found it impossible to raise $200,000 at this time for the Marconi Memorial, as had been contemplated.

The Foundation will raise $50,000, of which $34,000 has been collected. The Committee accordingly simplified its design, which Mr. Piccirilli presented. It proposes a figure of Marconi in bronze with an exedra, for which a platform approximately 30 by 20 feet is proposed. Judge Freschi said the following locations were inspected:

1. East Potomac Park. Hains Point was desired, but Mr. Caemmerer called attention to the fact that Hains Point had been selected for a memorial to former Secretary of the Interior Franklin Knight Lane. A site along the Washington Channel was therefore considered.

2. Columbia Island. The Committee was strongly in favor of a location about one-fourth of a mile south of the Arlington Memorial Bridge between the Mount Vernon Highway and the Potomac. It is one quarter mile away from the Navy and Marine Memorial and a Marconi Memorial there would not interfere with it. Inquiry was made as to the requirements for a foundation. The secretary stated that Mr. Gillen, Engineer of the National Park Service, has advised that a reinforced floating foundation would be sufficient, costing possibly $3,000. Perhaps a few piles would be desirable.

3. Rock Creek Parkway. Sunken garden site, near the Q Street Bridge.

4. Western Portal at Massachusetts and Western Avenue (District Line) where there is a circle 150 feet in diameter. The committee felt that at this location a memorial like the General Artemas Ward Statue would be necessary. That statue was inspected for the purpose of seeing a monument of that type and to observe how well a bronze statue and pedestal of Stony Creek granite harmonize.

5. Reservation near Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge, Southeast.

6. Anacostia Park near the Navy Yard.

7. Waterfront near the Army War College.

The discussion during the morning session centered on the Columbia Island site.

Mr. Manship asked about certain details of the proposed memorial. Mr. Piccirilli stated that the monument would be only 16 feet high, and that two high pylons originally intended have been omitted from the design. While a monument there would have its back towards the river, Mr. Piccirilli said he would expect planting for the background of the memorial and a suitable land-

scape plan for the grounds. Judge Freschi submitted a photograph of the location. He said the committee would like to dedicate the memorial in a year and a half.

Mr. Lamb felt that in the absence of a quorum, action should be deferred until the afternoon session. Judge Freschi was informed that a report would be sent to him in the near future.

The Commission considered the matter late in the afternoon. Mr. Clarke felt that a memorial such as this would lose itself on Columbia Island. He was also of the opinion that further study should be given to the type of design, preferably an allegorical one. The question was raised whether a suitable reservation in the city proper could be found for the memorial. Mr. Finman, Superintendent of National Capital Parks, who was present, offered to find such a reservation by the time of the next meeting October 15th. The Commission thereupon decided to defer action in this matter until the next meeting.

8. SOCIAL SECURITY AND RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD BUILDINGS: Under date of September 27th Mr. Louis Simon, Supervising Architect, submitted tentative drawings for these buildings, as follows:

Dear Sir:

There are being forwarded to you by special messenger, for comment and advice, blueprints of tentative drawings for the new buildings for the Social Security Board and the Railroad Retirement Board, this city.

There are also forwarded photographs of sketches showing the Independence Avenue and Third Street Elevations of the new Social Security Board building.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) Louis A. Simon,
Supervising Architect.

The Commission considered the design with Mr. Simon and Mr. Klauder. Mr. Klauder explained it saying that it presents an improved style of "fishbone"

building. The building will face Independence Avenue adjacent to the Mall and will have a central portion fully 340 feet long and right and left wings of about the same length. He said it is the type of building the Social Security Board wants. The facade showed a low base and deep window reveals. The Independence Avenue front and the sides will be of limestone. The rear of the building, which the Railroad Retirement Board will occupy, will be of gray brick. The building will be 73 feet high to the cornice and the projections 50 feet wide. There was an indication of sculpture on the building, which is to be given further study.

After discussion the Commission approved the design. (Exhibit D)

9. WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Mr. Simon presented sketches for the new War Department building to be located in the Northwest Rectangle, west of 19th Street. Mr. Underwood, architect, explained the sketches. He submitted three schemes:

1. The War Department Building on the west side of the intersection of Virginia and New York Avenues.

2. The War Department Building on the west side of a plaza, omitting Virginia and New York Avenues and 22nd Street closed in that section of the city.

3. A similar scheme as No. 2 with 22nd Street open.

Mr. Lamb thought it best to defer any action in this matter until the afternoon session.

The sketches were discussed during the afternoon at the joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. That Commission protested strongly against blotting out Virginia Avenue as it was considered necessary for the routing of trucks and other traffic from the southwest section of the city to Georgetown. It was decided that New York Avenue between Virginia Avenue and

Twenty-third Street might be omitted, and Mr. Simon was instructed to have a plan prepared accordingly and submitted to both Commissions. Captain Whitehurst, representing the District Commissioners, agreed to make studies for other routes which might adequately replace Virginia Avenue so as to make possible the scheme submitted.

10. MURAL PAINTING FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT: Under date of September 9th the following letter was received from Mr. Edward B. Rowan, Superintendent of the Section of Painting and Sculpture, Treasury Department:

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Attached herewith are two designs for the further mural decoration of the New Department of the Interior Building. They are the work of Mr. David McCosh and the finished murals are to be located at the south end of the main corridor on the third floor. The subject matter deals with the National Parks.

The comments and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts will be greatly appreciated.

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Edward B. Rowan, Superintendent,
Section of Painting and Sculpture.

The designs received the particular attention of Mr. Savage, and upon his recommendation the Commission approved them. (Exhibit E)

11. "FISHBONE" TYPE OF OFFICE BUILDING FOR WASHINGTON: By letter dated September 13, addressed to Mr. Clarke, Mr. Frederic A. Delano, Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission defended the "fishbone" type of office building. (Exhibit F)

Mr. Clarke presented the letter for the particular consideration of the architect members of the Commission. Action was deferred until the next meeting.

12. THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: During the meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in the afternoon a location plan was presented by Mr. Otto Eggers for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial south of the Washington Monument. Mr. Eggers said the location indicated in the plan had

been selected by Mr. Frederick Law Olmsted, who is being employed as the landscape architect of the project. The center of the memorial was shown to be 323.44 feet south of the intersection of Maryland Avenue and the Sixteenth Street axis. The National Capital Park and Planning Commission approved this location and also the Commission of Fine Arts.

Late in the afternoon Mr. Clarke presented to the Commission the draft of a letter he proposed to send to the President, in which he protested against misrepresentations made before the House Committee on Appropriations, when funds for the memorial were secured last spring. The Commission felt this should be made a matter of record. Accordingly the letter was approved and sent to the President. (Exhibit G)

13. BULFINCH GATEHOUSES: A location plan for the Bulfinch Gatehouses to be replaced on each side of Sixteenth Street north of Constitution Avenue was favorably considered during the morning session, as also the location of six gateposts in connection with them.

During the afternoon session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission that Commission protested strongly against locating the gatehouses at this site. The suggestion was made to take them back to the Capitol Grounds where they had been erected by Charles Bulfinch, Architect of the Capitol.

After discussion both Commissions decided that the gatehouses be left where they are at 15th and 17th Streets and Constitution Avenue but orientated to face Constitution Avenue. Attention is to be given later to the question of relocating the gateposts of which there are about eight in different locations.

14. KEY BRIDGE ARCH: Mr. Dudley C. Bayliss, Acting Chief of the Division of Plans and Designs, National Park Service, submitted a drawing for the additional

arch to be built on the Virginia side of the Key Bridge over the George Washington Memorial Parkway, suggesting the use of plywood as a form of lining which produces a texture similar to that of the original structure in the construction of the arch. Mr. Lamb thought this satisfactory and upon his recommendation the use of plywood was approved.

Mr. Bayliss also presented the suggestion to have an iron railing on the entire bridge instead of the parapet wall which now obstructs a view of the river when crossing the bridge. He said this would cost $60,000 but no funds for such a railing are available. He also stated that the District Engineer has stated the parapet wall is needed to give necessary strength to the bridge.

The Commission did not favor spending $5,000 for a railing on the new arch and decided that in the absence of funds for a railing for the entire bridge no change be made and that a parapet be built on the additional arch the same as on the existing bridge. (Exhibit H)

15. COLUMBIA ISLAND PLAZA: The Bureau of Public Roads submitted a design for the treatment of Columbia Island Plaza showing a circle at the center of the plaza. The design was referred to Mr. Clarke for study and action. (Exhibit I)

The Commission adjourned at 6:30 p. m. to meet Saturday October 15th.

DESIGNS OF FLAG FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
from the District of Columbia Flag Commission

Submitted by the following:

1. Mrs. William H. Harper,
The Wyoming Apt 214,
(Through Daughters of American Colonists Society)

2. Miss Katie V. Blount,
The Evangeline, 1330 L St., N. W.

3. Mr. John Q. Slye,
Secret Service Division,
Treasury Department.

4. Mrs. Mary Setz-Parker,
3718 Ingomar Street.

5. Mrs. Frisbey G. Eiker,
2001 Kalorama Road, N. W.

6. Mr. Edgar Fuller,
Box 103, West Salem, Ill.

7. Marion F. Holderman,
35 Eighth Street, N. E.

8. John H. Wood,
Amherst, Texas.
(Temporary address, 212 T St., N. E.,
Washington, D. C.)

9. Gen. Albert L. Cox, Commanding
D. C. National Guard,
(forwards design of flag of the
Headquarters of D. C. Militia)

10. Mrs. Charles L. Bancroft,
1711 East Capitol Street.

11. J. B. P. Clayton Hill,
Walter Reed General Hospital.

12. Miss Annabel Beecher Albert,
5034 Conduit Road, N. W.

13. Design received by special delivery mail
with no address on envelope. 8/25/38.

14. George M. Beckett, 1743 P Street, N. W.

15. Gilbert F. Greene, 602 Massachusetts Ave., N. W.

EXHIBIT A

16. Charles Dunn, 4710-49th St., N. W.

17. W. E. H., 503-3rd Street, N. W.

18. Andrew F. Eisemann, 1302 Park Road, N. W.

19. Ray G. Epperley, 728 Woodward Building.

20. Mrs. W. D. Leetch, 3 East Lennox Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

21. Mrs. B. E. A. McCann, Station A, Conduit Road, Georgetown, D. C.

X and Y J. A. Denekos, 1715 H Street, S. W. (submitted directly)

DESIGNS SELECTED BY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FLAG COMMISSION

A. Design based on shield portion of coat of arms of Washington family submitted by Mr. Hazen, August 24.
Including design by Mr. and Mrs. J. Moultrie Ward

B. Mrs. George T. Hawkins, 1616--16th St.

B-1. Suggestion by Mrs. Hawkins to substitute Washington Shield for Capitol Building. (Second choice of D. C. Commission)

C O P Y

September 30, 1938.

My dear Mr. Hazen:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on September 29th, consideration was given to the designs you submitted for the proposed District of Columbia Flag. The Commission expressed the desire that the District of Columbia Flag Commission meet with the Commission of Fine Arts at their next meeting to be held in Washington on Saturday, October 15th, for a consideration of the designs. The meeting will be held in the office of the Commission of Fine Arts, Room 7000, New Interior Department Building, at 10:00 a. m.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary.

Hon. M. C. Hazen, Chairman,
District of Columbia Flag Commission,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A-1

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Washington

September 30, 1938.

My dear Mr. Hazen:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 29, 1938, approved the model and preliminary plans submitted in your behalf by Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth, Municipal Architect, for the Municipal Center development, showing an unobstructed vista on John Marshall Place from Pennsylvania Avenue to the District of Columbia Court House.

Certain details of the landscape treatment of John Marshall Place will be worked out by a committee consisting of Mr. Wyeth and the Landscape Architect Members of the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

The Commission commended Mr. Wyeth upon the splendid result achieved and upon his cooperation in producing such eminently satisfactory plans.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. M. C. Hazen, President,
Board of Commissioners of
the District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT B

C O P Y

September 30, 1938.

My dear Mr. Hazen:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 29, 1938, approved designs submitted in your behalf by Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth, Municipal Architect, for the following District of Columbia projects:

District of Columbia Jail: Additional buildings.

District of Columbia Morgue: A new building to be located adjacent to the Congressional Cemetery, S. E.

Thomas Jefferson Junior High School: A new building for the Southwest section of the city.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. M. C. Hazen, President,
Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C I T I

September 30, 1938.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 29, 1938, approved the preliminary design for the Social Security Board building, which you submitted.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Hon. Louis Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

C O P Y

September 30, 1938.

Dear Mr. Rowan:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 29, 1938, considered the two designs which you submitted for mural decorations by David McCosh in the new Department of the Interior Building. The designs were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Eugene Savage, painter member of the Commission, and upon his recommendation were approved.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Edward B. Rowan,
Superintendent,
Section of Painting and Sculpture,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT E

C O P Y

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
INTERIOR BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Gilmore D. Clarke, Esq.,
Chairman, Commission of Fine Arts,
Washington, D. C.

At Newburgh, New York,
September 13, 1938.

My dear Mr. Clarke:

I understand that the Commission of Fine Arts has condemned what they call the "Fishbone" type of office building construction in Washington, D. C. I hope before this decision is confirmed or made final you will give me an opportunity to be heard. I do not claim to hold a brief for any particular building, or do I condemn any other particular building, but I would like to point out some of the practical arguments for and against each of these types, one of which I will call the "Closed Court Type", and the other I will call the "Open Court Type".

The Closed Court Type of building has been pretty generally adopted for all principal government buildings in Washington, as well as in the Capitals of Europe, and so long as these buildings were of moderate height (say not to exceed three stories) and the closed courts were of ample size, there was no objection to them. I recognize that they are more easily designed and that only the periphery of the building is seen by the general public. However, there is the objection that fully one-half of the offices open on a closed court and are, therefore, less desirable than outside rooms. In the fine old Treasury Building, which is of moderate height and with fair size courts (now all cluttered up), the inner offices are undesirable. On the other hand, as in the case of the Senate and House Office Buildings, where the buildings are not only fairly low but the courts very large, the offices on these interior courts are good, although undoubtedly less desirable than the offices opening outwards which have a wide and extensive view.

In the buildings in the so-called Northwest Triangle, built during the Coolidge-Hoover Administrations, while their general effect is very good, on closer approach they give the impression of being very crowded. Nearly all these buildings are built around closed courts, and as the buildings are seven to eight stories high, the courts seem relatively small and the inside offices are certainly less desirable than the outside offices.

Furthermore, there is the objection to the Closed Court plan that it makes the circulation in the building more complicated and difficult, and if anyone doubts this, I suggest that they go into any of the larger buildings of this Northwest Triangle group.

EXHIBIT F

Business men from other cities frequently criticize office buildings in Washington. They do not deny that they are very beautiful internally and externally, that they are very much more expensive to build than office buildings in other cities, but in spite of this, they find them inconvenient and say without hesitation that no business man would think of constructing such buildings for rent. Perhaps the principal reason for this is that one-half of the offices are inside offices.

Open Court buildings, it is recognized, are more difficult to design in order to give an agreeable appearance, but because they are less easy to design is not an argument for abandoning the problem. In the engineering profession, it is the Engineer's duty to work out the type of construction which will best meet the situation and accomplish the purposes the Engineer and his client hope to accomplish and at the same time yield the best return on the investment. Presumably the architect has somewhat the same problem; -- the use the building is to be put to, the space available, the total cost, the earning power, must all be considered, and it is the job of the architect to work out a design and so clothe it as to make it agreeable to look upon. Even though some Open Court buildings in Washington may be objected to as less attractive to look upon than certain Closed Court buildings, that can not be a sufficient argument for condemning the Open Court plan. Mr. Paul Cret employed the Open Court plan for the Federal Reserve Board building, and there are hundreds of office buildings, hotels, hospitals and apartment houses built on the Open Court plan which cannot all be condemned as ugly.

The efficiency of office buildings is frequently rated and compared on the basis of the net yield in rentable space; that is to say, a fair return on the total investment in land and building. In this method of comparison I have known buildings where every office was an outside office, and where the percentage of waste or unrentable floor space was less than twenty per cent of the total. Few Government offices would measure anywhere near such standards, and I will admit there is much to be said in favor of better standards for Government than for business space; but can it not be properly argued that we are going too far in selecting designs which are unnecessarily wasteful?

I am accompanying this letter with block floor plans in which I have shown on a large city block, such as we have in Washington, say, 400 feet by 600 feet in dimension between building lines, how the Open Court and Closed Court treatment may be used. I have assumed simple straight lines based on steel framed panels twenty feet square, which lends itself to almost any layout. These outlined plans show what may be done, and I respectfully suggest that instead of condemning one type of construction because you prefer another, you at least study the merits and demerits to be found in each type of construction.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Frederic A. Delano
Frederic A. Delano,
Chairman.

C O P Y

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
Washington

October 1, 1938.

Dear Mr. President:

Your Commission of Fine Arts reported last April fourth concerning the status of the Memorial to Thomas Jefferson, a project of major importance in the plan of the Nation's Capital. Since that report, Congress has decreed that that Memorial shall be constructed in accordance with plans which were not approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Your Commission desires to place before you certain facts leading up to this action of the House of Representatives and the Senate. The Commission fully believe that once Congress has all the facts in a case presented they decide a given question wisely and on the merit of those facts. However, when a portion of the facts are withheld, or when Congress is hurried into a choice without time for full deliberation, then the decision reached may not be wholly wise.

In the case of the Jefferson Memorial certain facts were withheld, the decision was hurried, and in addition other facts were grossly misrepresented by at least one member of the Jefferson Memorial Commission before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, as the record of that Hearing discloses.

Your Commission of Fine Arts fully believe that they acted in the best interests of the President, the Congress, the Jefferson Memorial Commission, and the people of the United States when they strongly advocated that a design indefensibly pedantic cannot represent the modern social feelings and character of your administration and our time and suitably honor Jefferson.

The proposed Memorial moreover seriously violates the established interrelationship of the principal elements of L'Enfant's Plan and the development of Washington today. The Commission still firmly believe that a Pantheon, a symbol of Imperial Rome, a slavish copy of a building erected by the Emperor Hadrian, is not representative of Thomas Jefferson and his significant contributions to the Nation still pertinent to today's problems.

The Commission further believe that it may not be too late to reconsider this matter. A canvass of the architectural and artistic professions in the United States would disclose, we believe, that among those most competent to judge, a large majority is overwhelmingly

opposed to the erection of a Roman Pantheon, of which there are already many in the United States, the latest prototype having been erected recently in Philadelphia to honor Benjamin Franklin.

Since the Commission of Fine Arts were not invited to be heard before the Committee of the House of Representatives, and since in our opinion the action of the Commission was misrepresented before that Committee, it appears that the President may possibly be interested in reviewing this matter with the Commission to the end that Thomas Jefferson may be more appropriately and more adequately honored by citizens of the United States.

The Commission of Fine Arts regret exceedingly the unfortunate controversy which arose; they further regret that it became necessary, on the part of at least one of the chief proponents of the Pantheon scheme, to misrepresent the facts in the case. Your Commission view this matter as of great significance in the development of the Nation's Capital and respectfully request the President's consideration of the facts to the end that the Central Composition of the National Capital may be developed in harmony with the great traditions which have obtained in the past.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT G

C O P Y

October 3, 1938.

Dear Mr. Cammerer:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on September 28th, considered Plan No. NCI-1306, showing the proposed architectural details for the new Key Bridge Underpass, which specified the arrangement and type of forms predicated on the use of plywood lining. This was given particular attention by the architect members of the Commission and upon their recommendation the plan was approved.

With reference to the suggestion made by your office that an iron railing be substituted for the existing parapet at the sides of the Key Bridge, the Commission advise that, in the absence of funds, no change be made. The additional arch for the Key Bridge should therefore be constructed exactly like the existing bridge.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. A. B. Cammerer, Director,
National Park Service,
Interior Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

C C P I

October 3, 1938.

Mr. H. J. Spelman
District Engineer
Bureau of Public Roads
United States Department
of Agriculture
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Spelman:

I sincerely regret that the members of the Commission found it necessary to leave a recent joint meeting with the Planning Commission before you presented the Columbia Island driveway plans.

These plans were reviewed and approved at the meeting of this Commission held Thursday last in Washington. It is assumed that the indicated path locations relate properly to the location of the formal rows of trees. Slight changes in the tree locations may be necessary to insure that the long straight paths center between the proposed double rows of trees.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

GDC:R

EXHIBIT I

Extract of Minutes of Joint Meeting of National Capital Park and Planning Commission and Commission of Fine Arts, September 29, 1938.

PRESENT.

MEMBERS: MR. F. A. DELANO, Chairman.
MR. CAMMERER, Vice Chairman.
COL. ATKINS.
COL. McCOACH.
MR. KNEIPP.
MR. W. A. DELANO.
MR. HUBBARD.

Members of the staff also present.

The Commission of Fine Arts joined the meeting for a joint discussion of the following subjects:

17. Municipal Center: (See also Pars. 16 and 20):

MR. NATHAN WYETH, Municipal Architect, presented and explained in detail a model showing the latest plan for the Municipal Center, leaving John Marshall Place open to Indiana Avenue. He stated that the plan submitted to the Fine Arts Commission on August 10 provided for a width of 250 feet between the buildings, but that later this had been reduced to 230 feet with the consent of the Commission of Fine Arts.

MR. NOLEN stated that the Commission's staff has studied the cross section of the court, particularly in relation to the area south of C Street, and the only issue now involved is the location of walks leading through the plaza between the buildings, and the relationship of these walks to ones south of C Street. It is also the feeling of the staff that these walks should terminate in some feature at the steps. The question of portico and steps were also discussed, particularly by MR. PARTRIDGE, as well as the design below C Street. The staff feels that the plaza might be tapered or narrowed as it extends northward to the court house by retaining the 210-foot width proposed by the Commission below C Street.

Discussion included the fact that it is important to keep the streets open between C Street and Pennsylvania Avenue because of the circulation needed for public buildings that will probably be located south of C Street; views of MR. PARTRIDGE, who has studied this plan, already expressed by MR. NOLEN: the relationship of 4th Street south of Pennsylvania Avenue to the development to the north; the present and future tree arrangement on John Marshall Place; that the view southward is as important as the view northward to the court house; feeling of the Commission of Fine Arts that the green strip through the center of the plaza could be slightly narrowed; that the streets bordering the plaza are really service streets for the adjoining buildings; possible provision for angular parking; opinion of the Coordinating Committee concerning diagonal parking on 4th Street south of Pennsylvania Avenue; suggestion that angular parking might be provided on the building sides of the driveway; feeling of the Coordinating Committee that no diagonal parking should be permitted in the whole downtown area.

Further discussion included the desirability of prompt action in connection with these plans so as not to jeopardize the project, possibility of eliminating the columns at the end of the building facing John Marshall Place, and the opinion of the architect that this could not be done.

MR. WYETH stated that his office is proceeding with the preparation of working drawings.

18. Central Library Building in Municipal Center Area:

MR. WYETH stated that Congress appropriated $60,000 for the preparation of plans for the central library building in the Municipal Center area on Square 491 north of Pennsylvania Avenue and west of John Marshall Place. It was pointed out that the building does not follow the line of Pennsylvania Avenue.

MR. NOLEN reported that this is a recent development since the Commission took action in June with relation to the building line, and makes the south building line for this building parallel to Constitution Avenue instead of Pennsylvania Avenue, and reduces the mass of the building considerably.

Discussion included the fact that the President feels that an auditorium should be constructed to hold large gatherings of people, and that could be used for many other purposes, preferably on land further outlying in the city and much cheaper; establishing a museum for Washington; use of the old Court House as a municipal museum.

MR. PARTRIDGE, in discussing the library site, stated that it is his feeling that it is a mistake to establish a different system of building lines, and consideration should be given of the desirability of preserving the lines of Pennsylvania Avenue, which raises the question of whether the original L'Enfant Plan will be adhered to; that it would materially affect the monumental appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue to disrupt the north side of the Avenue with a treatment not originally contemplated.

No action at this time on this matter.

19. War Department Building: (See also Pars. 22 and 48):

Brief discussion but no action.

20. Municipal Center: (See also Pars. 16 and 17):

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission approves in general terms plans for the Municipal Center group, as shown on plan bearing File No. 1.18-89, and model submitted by MR. WYETH at this meeting, with the understanding that certain minor details of these plans may be adjusted by the Committee created at this meeting for this purpose, consisting of MR. HUBBARD of this Commission and MAJ. CLARKE of the Commission of Fine Arts.

The Chairman also directed that there be entered on these minutes a record of the Commission's appreciation for the excellent way in which MR. WYETH revised his plans for the Municipal Center and began anew at the request of the two Commissions.

MAJ. CLARKE stated that the Commission of Fine Arts is also highly appreciative of MR. WYETH'S cooperation and expresses to him the same feeling.

21. Social Security Board Building:

MR. NOLEN reported that the Commission's action to date with respect to this building and the Railroad Retirement Board building is limited to the height of the building and the building lines. Revisions in the plans conform to the Commission's action, and the plans now submitted by the Treasury Department involve the general form of the building and the general design. The Commission had asked further study on the arrangement of the courts, which has also been done.

MR. LOUIS SIMON, Procurement Division, submitted plans for this building, and stated that the views of the Commission concerning the treatment of the ends and the setback for the building had been met, and the general outlines of the building has been modified materially. Further details of the plan were explained by MR. SIMON. He stated further that the front of the building will be of Indiana limestone and the sides and back will be of brick, which will be necessary on account of the cost.

MR. NOLEN stated that the plan approved at the July meeting provided for a controlling elevation of 88 feet for the parapet, 103 feet for the top setback, and 108 feet for the stem. Those elevations have been revised from 88 feet to 91.56 feet and from 103 feet to 106.81 feet. The staff sees no objections to these minor increases due to changes in floor levels.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission approves in principle plan bearing File No. 1.17-51 for the Social Security Board building, with the understanding that the details will be worked out between this Commission and the Procurement Division.

MAJ. CLARKE stated that his Commission has approved these plans.

22. War Department Building: (See also Pars. 19 and 48):

MESSRS. SIMON, UNDERWOOD and FOSTER presented plans for this building.

MR. UNDERWOOD explained in detail the plans for the smaller of the two buildings, and stated that the problem as it affects his present design primarily involves traffic. They have attempted to design a simple building and get away from a structure of great length. They have also prepared sketches showing the future effect on Virginia and New York Avenues. One of their plans contemplates the closing of 22nd Street to provide for the headquarters building. They have also prepared a plan involving the closing of Virginia Avenue and providing a wide court area between the buildings. They do not expect to provide basement parking for automobiles, but it is probable that limited parking can be absorbed in the area itself.

Discussion included the extension of a parking strip running east and west, which would extend all the way to the river; whether elimination of Virginia Avenue would create a traffic problem to the north or south of the area, especially Pennsylvania Avenue; extension of the Navy Department development to the river; suggestion of the Procurement Division that a bypass traffic route be provided south of the Reflecting Pool from 14th Street; feeling of the architects for the building that it would be a mistake to have an asphalt strip in the middle of this composition; feeling that having a heavy traffic movement through this area on the diagonal avenues will interpose a serious traffic hazard and an undue amount of activity; feeling of MAJ. CLARKE that the building should not be located around a heavy traffic intersection, because of the noise and activity; that closing the diagonal avenues would interpose serious traffic objections to the north and south of the area; whether location for the buildings is based on the closing of Virginia Avenue.

CAPT. WHITEHURST, Director of Highways for the District of Columbia, stated that the majority of the traffic now using Virginia Avenue originates in Georgetown, and it is absolutely necessary that Virginia Avenue remain open for this traffic; that if Virginia Avenue is closed, it will be necessary for this traffic to use Pennsylvania Avenue and then be thrown into the now heavily congested intersection at 15th Street; that in all probability if Virginia Avenue is closed, the time will soon come when it will be necessary to open the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway and Constitution Avenue to heavy truck traffic; that if Virginia Avenue is closed, it will mean that all of this heavy traffic passes in front of the White House and then down 15th Street; that it is absolutely necessary to bear this heavy traffic in mind in considering the closing of Virginia Avenue; that Virginia Avenue also carries utilities such as sewer, water, gas and electricity, which would be very expensive and difficult to relocate.

Further discussion included the fact that if Virginia Avenue is closed, it will probably result in the necessity of permitting this heavy traffic to use Constitution Avenue; extension of E Street east of 17th Street, and the difficulties that would be encountered between 15th and 17th Streets, through the park area; suggestion of MR. NOLEN that the Treasury Department be requested to make studies leaving Virginia Avenue open and showing an arrangement of the buildings to the east and west of the intersection of this Avenue and New York Avenue; constructing a tunnel under the Ellipse; the feeling that 22nd Street could be closed.

MR. SIMON withdrew from the meeting at this point, but stated that his office would give further study to the questions raised by the Commission.

The Commission of Fine Arts also temporarily withdrew at this point.

23. Promotion of COL. SULTAN:

The Secretary announced that COL. SULTAN, formerly a member of the Commission and District Engineer Commissioner, had just been promoted to Brigadier General in the U. S. Army. The Chairman suggested that the Executive Officer send a telegram of congratulations to COL. SULTAN expressing the pleasure of the Commission on learning of this promotion.

MR. SETTLE also stated that the Chairman had forwarded to the Secretary of War and Chief of Staff copy of the resolution of the Commission lauding COL. SULTAN'S services as a member of the Commission, and that had become a part of his military record.

24. Jefferson Memorial: (See also Par. 27):

MR. OTTO EGGERS appeared before the Commission and submitted the latest revised plans for the location of and approaches to the Jefferson Memorial. He stated that the revised plan, which indicates the location of the Memorial, has been prepared in consultation with Olmsted Brothers. The original plan showed the dimension of 400 feet from the point where the Maryland Avenue axis crosses the axis of 16th Street. This dimension has been reduced and the building pushed northward to a point where it is 323.44 feet from the intersection of the Maryland Avenue axis. The main reason for that change was to get greater distance from the Memorial to the 14th Street approach to the Highway Bridge. The building is 150 feet in diameter to the outside lines of the columns (originally 165 feet). The statue will face northward, and the inside diameter of the building is 82 feet.

Discussion included entrance to the building from the north only; permitting parking of automobiles around the Memorial, etc.

The Commission of Fine Arts rejoined the meeting at this point.

The Chairman, in reviewing this matter for the benefit of the Commission of Fine Arts, stated that the building itself has been made smaller and moved further northward nearer the water; that the plans have also been checked as to the road layout, etc. A 24-foot wide road has been provided around the Memorial to be restricted to only occasional use.

MR. HUBBARD stated that Olmsted Brothers has prepared a landscape plan for the Memorial and discussed the features of the plan, including provision for parking, road layout, etc.

Further discussion included the desirability of not putting in too much planting material inside the road about the Memorial and adjacent to the Tidal Basin; reducing the grade of the area toward the basin; raising the grade of the 14th Street approach to 15 feet to be above flood level; enlarging the curb returns at the ends of the roads in front of the building; slightly raising the grade of the entrance to the road around the Memorial to discourage its use by the general public; the method of admitting light to the interior of the Memorial.

No action at this time.

25. Bull Finch Gate Houses:

MR. NOLEN reported that a proposal by the National Park Service has been submitted for consideration of the Commission to locate on the axis of 16th Street on north side of Constitution Avenue the Bullfinch gate houses now at 15th and 17th Streets, and the old posts, in the form of a gateway marking the entrance into the Ellipse. The plan shows as part of the proposal a future fence along Constitution Avenue from 15th to 17th Street.

MR. PARTRIDGE has studied this matter and suggests that these be grouped not as an entrance to the Ellipse, but as a formal marking of the entrance to the area east of the Capitol. He also sees no reason for creating a monumental entrance to the Ellipse, and it is his feeling that they should be moved back to the east front of the Capitol where they were originally located.

MAJ. CLARKE feels that it would be a mistake to place these in front of the Capitol, because they would be entirely out of relation architecturally with the Capitol and surrounding area.

MOTION unanimously carried (the Commission of Fine Arts concurring) that the Bullfinch gate houses be left in their present location at 15th & 17th Sts. but that they be repaired and correctly oriented facing Constitution Avenue.

26. Revision of the Shipstead Act Area:

MR. NOLEN recommended that the area subject to the Shipstead Act be enlarged to cover properties in the new northwest building area so as to include private property facing south on the proposed public building development south of E Street. The new line to be covered by the Act would follow E Street west from 19th Street, north on 20th Street, west on F Street, south on 21st Street, west on E Street, northwest on Virginia Avenue, then south on 22nd Street, and then west on E Street. Under the Shipstead Act, it is necessary for the Planning Commission to recommend that this change be made to the District Commissioners, and such recommendation is made by the staff.

Discussion included the advisability of conferring with the architects for the two apartments to be erected in this area with a view to having them consult with the Commission of Fine Arts concerning their architectural treatment.

MOTION unanimously carried that the staff of the Commission prepare a map showing the proposed extension of the Shipstead area as recommended by the staff, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Commission of Fine Arts, the same to be submitted to the District Commissioners with the approval of this Commission.

The Commission of Fine Arts withdrew at this point.